

III. REMARKS

A. Explanation of Amendments to the Specification

Applicants have amended paragraphs [0042] and [0057] to correct typographical errors.

B. Response to the Claim Rejections

In the Office Action mailed on October 19, 2006, the Examiner: (1) rejected claims 1, 2, 6-20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 32-49, and 54 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by published U.S. Patent Application No. 10/238,373 by Buddhikot et al. (hereinafter "Buddhikot"); and (2) rejected claims 3, 5, 23, and 27-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Buddhikot and published U.S. Patent Application No. 10/218,368 by Molteni et al. (hereinafter "Molteni"). (Office Action, pages 2-4) Of the rejected claims, claims 1, 20, 24, 25, 38, 45, and 54 are independent. Applicants have amended claims 1, 20, 24, and 54 to further specify the functions performed by the particular entities in the particular combination and context recited in the amended claims; however, the same or similar functions are performed by other entities in other contexts as described in the specification and the other pending claims and thus, Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims of varying scope based on other particular combinations and contexts consistent with the original disclosure. Applicants submit that original claims 25 and 38 and amended claims 1, 20, 24, and 54 are allowable over Buddhikot because the Buddhikot reference does not teach each and every claim element for at least the reasons set forth below.

1. Claims 1-19, 24, 25-37, 38-44, and 54

Applicants have amended claims 1, 24, and 54 to further specify the functions performed by the particular entities in the particular combination and context recited in the amended claims; however, the same or similar functions are performed by other entities in other contexts as described in the specification and the other pending claims. Amended claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "inserting an access point identifier into a mobile registration message at a mobile station..." and amended claims 24 and 54 recite, *inter alia*, "inserting into a mobile registration message at a mobile station, an access point identifier." Similarly, original claims

25 and 38 recite, *inter alia*, a “mobile station comprising computer instructions stored in memory and executable by a processor” for performing or to perform “the functions of: inserting an access point identifier into a mobile registration message...”

Unlike amended claims 1, 24, and 54 and original claims 25 and 38, Buddhikot describes a process where “[t]he foreign network 12 provides a signal 30 to the [mobile station] MN 22 comprising an AP identifier (AP ID) and requesting the [mobile station] MN 22 for identification” and where “[t]he [mobile station] MN 22 responds by providing signal 32, which includes the [mobile station’s] MN’s 22 network access identifier (NAI), and a random session identifier (Session ID) generated by the [mobile station] MN 22.” (Buddhikot, Paragraph [0022], lines 9-16). Indeed, Buddhikot describes mobile station MN 22 as sending only two signals: (1) signal 32, shown in Figures 2 and 3, “[comprising] MN’s 22 NAI and the session ID, which is randomly generated by the MN 22” (Buddhikot, paragraph [0027]); and (2) signal 40, shown in Figures 2 and 3, “comprising the first authenticator and the second random number.” (Buddhikot, paragraph [0029]) Neither signal 32 nor signal 40 sent from mobile station (MN 22) contain an access point identifier and therefore, Buddhikot does not show or suggest: (1) “inserting an access point identifier into a mobile registration message at a mobile station...” as recited in amended claim 1; (2) “inserting into a mobile registration message at a mobile station, an access point identifier” as recited in amended claims 24 and 54; or (3) a “mobile station comprising computer instructions stored in memory and executable by a processor” for performing or to perform “the functions of: inserting an access point identifier into a mobile registration message...” as recited in original claims 25 and 38.

Therefore, Applicants submit that amended claim 1 is allowable over Buddhikot for at least the reason that Buddhikot does not disclose “inserting an access point identifier into a mobile registration message at a mobile station...” as recited in amended claim 1. Claims 2-18 depend from amended claim 1. Therefore, Applicants further submit that claims 2-18 are allowable over Buddhikot for at least the reason that they depend from an allowable claim.

Applicants also submit that claims 25 and 38 are allowable over Buddhikot for at least the reason that Buddhikot does not disclose a “mobile station comprising computer instructions stored in memory and executable by a processor” for performing or to perform “the functions of: inserting an access point identifier into a mobile registration message...” as recited in claims

25 and 38. Claims 26-37 depend from claim 25 and claims 39-44 depend from claim 38. Therefore, Applicants further submit that claims 26-37 and claims 39-44 are allowable over Buddhikot for at least the reason that they depend from allowable claims 25 and 38, respectively.

Applicants also submit that amended claims 24 and 54 are allowable over Buddhikot for at least the reason that Buddhikot does not disclose “inserting into a mobile registration message at a mobile station, an access point identifier” as recited in amended claims 24 and 54.

2. Claims 20-23 and Claims 45-49

Applicants have amended claims 20 and 45 to further specify the functions performed by the particular entities in the particular combination and context recited in the amended claims; however, the same or similar functions are performed by other entities in other contexts as described in the specification and the other pending claims. Amended claims 20 and 45 now recite, *inter alia*, “receiving from a mobile station, a mobile registration message comprising an access point identifier via an access point into the wireless network.”

Applicants find nothing in Buddhikot that shows or suggests “receiving from a mobile station, a mobile registration message comprising an access point identifier...” as recited in amended claims 20 and 45. Instead, Buddhikot describes mobile station MN 22 as sending two signals: (1) signal 32, shown in Figures 2 and 3, “[comprising] MN’s 22 NAI and the session ID, which is randomly generated by the MN 22” (Buddhikot, paragraph [0027]); and (2) signal 40, shown in Figures 2 and 3, “comprising the first authenticator and the second random number.” (Buddhikot, paragraph [0029]) Neither signal 32 nor signal 40 contain an access point identifier and thus nothing in Buddhikot can “receiv[e] from a mobile station, a mobile registration message comprising an access point identifier.”

Therefore, Applicants submit that amended claims 20 and 45 are allowable over Buddhikot for at least the reason that Buddhikot does not show or suggest “receiving from a mobile station, a mobile registration message comprising an access point identifier” as recited in amended claims 20 and 45. Claims 21-23 depend from claim 20 and claims 46-49 depend from claim 45. Therefore, Applicants further submit that claims 21-23 and claims 46-49 are

allowable over Buddhikot for at least the reason that they depend from allowable claims 20 and 45, respectively.

III. CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is hereby requested. Should the Examiner feel that further dialog would advance the subject application to issuance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (312) 913-3305.

Respectfully submitted,
McDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP

Date: February 19, 2007

By: /Robert J. Irvine III/
Robert J. Irvine III
Registration No. 41,865